

WHITHER PALESTINE?

*A Statement of Facts and of
Causes of the Arab-Jewish
Conflict in the Holy Land*



Issued by

THE ARAB NATIONAL LEAGUE
303 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK CITY

WHITHER PALESTINE?

*A Statement of Facts and of
Causes of the Arab-Jewish
Conflict in the Holy Land*



Issued by

THE ARAB NATIONAL LEAGUE
303 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK CITY

Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Palestine and Its People	5
3. The Arabs of Palestine	11
4. The Jews: Their Right and Claim to Palestine	15
5. Zionism	18
6. The British in Palestine and the Balfour Promise	25
7. The Mandate	31
8. The Present Revolt in Palestine	38
9. Arab Claims and Demands	40
10. Whither Palestine?	42
Bibliography	43

Introduction

DURING the last two decades the attention of the world has been directed to Palestine. Not merely for spiritual guidance nor as an inspiration for world peace has public attention been directed to that ancient land. Palestine has been heard of as a region of strife and bloodshed. Moreover, much that has been written and said about Palestine and its present troubles has come to the reader from prejudiced sources. Little is known of what has been written and said by impartial observers—men and women without an “axe to grind” and much of the truth has escaped the average reader. It is hard for people in the United States and in western Europe to obtain accurate data about recent events in the land which is sacred and holy to Christians, Jews and Moslems alike. Despite a general wish for impartial information the public is beset by the forces of emotion and sentiment now rampant in the world at large. And those who insist on impartial judgments are often themselves victims of emotion, sentiment and prejudice. It is high time that the intelligent and truth-seeking minority of responsible individuals should be made acquainted with the facts about current conditions in Palestine.

Those facts are not entirely available to the English-speaking world because the press of Europe and America is largely dominated by British and Zionist interests. But there is another side to the Palestinian question. There is the Arab side. But little of the Arab side reaches us because of European prejudice and our general unfamiliarity with the Arabic tongue.

In depicting international matters it is unwise to misrepresent the facts or evade the truthful issue. Untruths and evasions are boomerangs. Distortions of fact and mendacious propaganda affect their authors as well as their intended victims. Thus are seeds of hatred and prejudice foolishly sown by the purveyors of false ideas and twisted facts.

In preparing this pamphlet the Arab National League of America has sincerely tried to be objective; to state the facts

impartially; to avoid controversial matters whose truth or falsity is beyond human verification. The League is trying to rest its appeal upon the merits of the case without resort to common prejudice and common misinformation. Further, no attempt is made herein to raise more issues than already exist, nor to stress unduly past grievances and errors.

In issuing this pamphlet the League hopes that it is serving, not only the cause of Arabs and Jews everywhere, but also the causes of justice, democracy and world peace.

It is, in brief, the wish of the Arab National League of America that this pamphlet will reach many open minds regardless of racial and religious affiliations. The League is concerned not only with the cogent problem here presented, but also with the largest problem of our time—the problem of securing “Peace on earth and good will to all men.”

Palestine and Its People

PRIOR to the World War and the creation of the mandate system, Palestine, Syria and Transjordan were, from time immemorial, all one country known as Syria; and its inhabitants were known as Syrians. Although the terms “Syrians” and “Arabs” are used synonymously, the latter name is now applied to the non-Jewish population of Palestine.

The area of Palestine, excluding Transjordan, is approximately 10,100 square miles (6,464,000 acres or 25,856,000 dunams), that is about the size of the state of New Hampshire and not unlike it in shape.

In the census of 1931, the population of Palestine is given as 1,035,821, composed as follows:

Moslems (Arabs)	759,712
Jews	174,610
Christians (Arabs)	91,398

The balance is composed of Druses, Europeans, Americans and other nationalities.

Since 1931 the population has reached approximately 1,400,000 of which about 375,000 are Jews. This increase was brought about partly by natural growth but, chiefly by mass immigration of Jews.

With a birth rate about twice the death rate, the present population will double itself, without the addition of one immigrant, in about twenty-five years.

The density of the population is about 140 persons per square mile compared with about 41 per square mile in the United States.

Palestine has no industrial or agricultural possibilities for any nation to envy or covet. Generally speaking, it is a mountainous plateau and less than half of its total area is arable. It has no forests, minerals, great rivers or lakes, and its rainfall is scanty. It can safely be said that Palestine has no worthwhile natural resources and that at no time can it support its present population without help from outside sources.

Yet despite its small size and meagre natural resources Palestine has from the dawn of time made more history than any other country and will, perhaps, continue to do so for a long time to come.

Although the land has great religious and historical importance yet it is not these values which explain the interests of Western Imperialism in its "freedom." Not because of "oil fields," or "natural resources," or "the welfare of its inhabitants" are Western Imperialists concerned with ruling the land, but because Palestine is near the Suez Canal and the road to India.

In regard to the land of Palestine it is generally conceded that agriculture is the backbone of the country and the "sheet-anchor" of most of its inhabitants.

Some facts and opinions about the agricultural possibilities of Palestine may be gathered from the following references:

W. E. Hocking (The Spirit of World Politics, page 340) says: "About half of the total area of Palestine is reckoned as cultivable. And of this half, barely more than a third, i. e., one-sixth of the whole area, with irrigation and drainage, can be considered fairly good valley land, including both light and heavy soil."

According to the Joint Palestine Survey conducted in 1928 (under the auspices of the Zionist Organization) there are about four million dunams (one million acres) of such good valley land. In 1930 the Commissioner of Lands reported slightly over twelve million dunams (three million acres) as the entire cultivable area throughout the country.

In 1927 the investigators who had studied agricultural colonization by authority of The Joint Palestine Survey Commission found much overcrowding in the Zionist settlements. They recommended 60 acres as the minimum lot viable for dry farming and 20 acres for irrigated land.

The official committee which, in 1930, reported on the economic condition of agriculture in Palestine, concluded that to provide a minimum living for the family of an owner-cultivator about 19 acres are necessary; while for the family of a tenant who must give up part of his income for rent about 30 acres are essential.

Hocking (in the above-mentioned book, page 341) states: "But we must again consider: it is not 160,000 Jews who are engaged in agriculture, but only some 33,000: the rest are urban. It is one-thirtieth of the population that are holding that fifth of the best land, and it is not enough for them—by far not enough."

And so what will be said when the number of Jews has increased from 160,000 to 375,000? If the number of Jewish farmers has increased in the same ratio there must be about 75,000 Jews engaged in agriculture today. Yet the entire number of parcels of land available for both Jews and Arabs is estimated at between 75,000 and 100,000.

Palestine is primarily an agricultural country. There are a few industries, but these are in an early stage of development and have to depend largely on protection. Most of the manufacturing industries are Jewish, but even so they cannot compete with industry in neighboring Syria and other countries. Raw materials must be imported copiously for industry. In consequence imports into Palestine exceed exports to the rest of the world, and so the land suffers from a chronically unfavorable trade balance.

In the review "Palestine and Transjordan" (June 13, 1936) this matter of industry in Palestine is well summed up as follows:

"Considerable attention has been given for some time, in Jewish industrial circles, to criticizing the Palestine-Syria Trade agreement of 1929, by virtue of which goods produced in either country are to be admitted into the other free of import duty. The agreement had been concluded with the view to facilitate and increase trade between the two countries. This matter was specifically envisaged in the Mandate, and while the first part of Art. 18 prevented the Mandatory from any discrimination against goods originating in, or destined for, any of the State members of the League, the last part of the article allowed the government to "conclude a special agreement with any State, the territory of which in 1914 was wholly included in Asiatic Turkey."

The trade statistics with Syria show the following figures:

<i>Year</i>	<i>Imports from Syria</i>		<i>Exports to Syria</i>	
1928	L P	944,711	L P	358,087
1929	"	1,055,617	"	307,087
1930	"	1,035,411	"	210,342
1931	"	1,016,948	"	222,527
1932	"	813,241	"	229,903
1933	"	942,683	"	212,982
1934	"	1,083,095	"	222,643
1935	"	1,310,363	"	302,988

The special interest taken by Jewish industrial circles in this Trade Agreement has been due to the fact that Jewish industries have so far been unable to command a sufficient market in Syria and Lebanon, in spite of the many ways and means used to reach this end.

In a recent article published in the "Palestine Review," Dr. Alfred Marcus gives a clear summary of the trade in "industrial goods" between the two countries, and explains that the expectations of a rapid expansion of Palestinian trade in the Syrian market have been disappointing.

There is ample proof that Palestine's industries, which are mostly Jewish, have not been able to command markets in Syria or other parts of the Near East; and Dr. Marcus has stated frankly that Syrian competition is becoming a serious obstacle to the industrial development of Palestine; also that agriculture has to contend with the growing menace of Syrian competition.

In view of this situation, Jewish industrialists are perplexed. They do not suggest that the whole agreement should be abolished, but they propose, for instance, that Syrian manufactured goods like cement, boots and shoes, beer and other things, should be taxed at the general rate of customs duty.

The real facts about Jewish industry, as shown by the expert reports, are simply amazing. According to Sir John Hope Simpson the average number of persons employed in industries in 1928 was only 5.1 per establishment. After reviewing the condition of Jewish industries up to 1930 he says, "there is not any reason to believe that Palestine offers special attractions to large industrial concerns. The industries likely to succeed are

those that are based on local products, or, being based on imported products, show special vitality." As to the existing industries, thanks are due to the high protective tariffs accorded them by Government. The same report says on this point, "it is clear that the 'Nesher' Cement Factory is dependent on protection not only for its profits, but for its existence. It could not compete with imported cement were the protective tariff withdrawn. The withdrawal of the duty on imported oilseeds appeared to be a necessity to the success of the 'Shemen' oil factory. The Cellars of Richon-Le-Zion and Zichron-Jacob owe their very existence, not to economic action, but to the liberality and interest of Baron Edmond de Rothschild. The industry continues to prosper by reason of the protective duties on imported wines and spirits . . . The rest of the population is taxed in order that the proprietors of these industrial concerns may be in a position to pay the wages of their laborers and to make a profit for themselves."

Some idea of recent Jewish immigration into Palestine may be gathered from the following figures: On September 1, 1922, there were 158,000 Jews in the country. At the end of 1935 there were 375,000. This abnormal influx of Jews in 13 years represents an increase of 237 per cent. It is known that in the three-year period 1933-1935 nearly 180,000 Jews entered the country, of whom only 136,000 could have done so legally.

While no exact figures as to unemployment in Palestine are available it is possible to form some idea of Arab unemployment from the landless condition of those people. The following facts relevant to this matter are taken from "The Palestine Arab Cause" by T. Canaan, 1936:

"29.4 per cent of all Arab families are landless. An area of at least 130 dunams is required to maintain a fellah family in a decent standard of life. But in reality every Arab family has, if the available land should be divided among the Arab families, only 90 dunams. Not a single Arab farmer who held less than 120 dunams was able to live on the produce of his farm without outside employment. (See White Paper, 1930, and the John Hope Simpson Report, p. 64.) Moreover, it is well known that recent Jewish settlers are expected and, indeed, obligated to

hire only Jewish labor. The Keren-Kaymeth lease contains the following clause:

"The lessee undertakes to execute all works connected with the cultivation of the holding only with Jewish labor. Failure to comply with this duty by the employment of non-Jewish labor shall render the lessee liable to the payment of a compensation of ten Palestinian pounds for each default . . . Where the lessee has contravened the provisions of this article three times, the fund may apply the right of restitution of the holding, without paying any compensation whatever."

Since the publication of the Simpson Report (1930) no less than 500,000 dunams of land have been sold to the Jews. Thus Arabs increasingly find themselves without land and without the right to work upon it, even for hire.

The Arabs of Palestine

HISTORY and archeology clearly demonstrate that the "Arabs" of Palestine are a mixed race. Many of them can be traced to several races that occupied the country long before the Hebrew invasion, such as the Moabites, the Jebusites, Hittites, the Philistines, and the Canaanites. Professor Elihu Grant, the well-known archeologist states:

"This will be seen to be an essay in understanding of an almost forgotten folk, the native Canaanite peasantry of Palestine, the majority population for thousands of years, a farming people of whom about one hundred thousand still remain Christians today, while six or seven hundred thousands are Moslems.

"Brilliant personalities have come from this peasantry, but I have chosen the simplest of their class, a decent country-folk, sound in body and mind, patient and patriotic, the basic stock of the country."

It should also be noted that at no time did the Hebrews conquer or occupy all of Palestine. The Philistines were never conquered but remained masters of their portion of the land long after the fall of the Kingdom of Judah and the Kingdom of Israel. It is the irony of history that the land of Israel should be called Palestine after the Philistines, the arch enemies of the Hebrews.

Palestine was also invaded by Babylonia, Persia, Egypt, Greece, and Rome. Under all of these occupations and at all times there lived in some sections of Palestine other races besides the Hebrews. Of all these races, the Hebrews alone were taken into captivity. None of the other races were carried away from the land, or exterminated at the hands of ruthless conquerors. About the time of Christ and under the Romans, the Gentile population of Palestine was very large.

Jerusalem fell to Titus in 70 A.D., and in 135 A.D. Hadrian expelled all of the Jews from Jerusalem and forbade them to return.

Hebrew influence on the races of Palestine was negligible. In fact these races exercised more influence on the Hebrews. Since

the time of Christ and after, the language spoken by the Jews of Palestine was Aramaic and not Hebrew. The latter was used in the synagogue and for religious ceremonies only.

Up to the Arab conquest the country remained part of the Roman (Byzantine) Empire, and was predominantly Christian.

In August 636 A.D. the Arabs under Omar won a historic victory at the battle of Yarmouk and wrested the country from the Byzantines. The Covenant of Omar guaranteed full liberty to the "inhabitants of Aelia (Jerusalem), to all of them without distinction, be they well disposed or ill disposed." This document which was signed by Omar and witnessed by four of his generals is a shining example of Arab tolerance and statesmanship which may well be emulated by British diplomats. Fifteen years later, a Nestorian bishop wrote: "These Arabs to whom God has given the power nowadays, do not fight Christianity. In fact, they protect our belief, respect our priests and holy men and give presents to our churches and monasteries."

The benevolent rule of the Arabs continued until 1516 A.D. when the country became part of the Turkish Empire.

The story of the Crusaders in the 11th and 12th centuries is too well known to warrant repetition here. However, it is interesting to mention that, in spite of their defeat by Saladin, many of the Crusaders settled in the country. Marriages between them and the native population were frequent as is evidenced by European features not uncommon in Palestine today.

Thus, for at least the last 1300 years Palestine has been an Arab country.

From the above it is evident that the Palestine Arab is not the wandering nomad that Zionist propagandists have portrayed to the western world. He has clung tenaciously to the land which he has dearly loved and valiantly defended. Turkish rule made little impression on Arab Palestine except in hindering its progress. The Palestine Arab is heir to a rich heritage with a tradition of chivalry, courage, culture, hospitality and tolerance. Between the 7th and 14th centuries the Arab Empire was in its golden era and the Arabs, who ruled an area greater than the Roman Empire, were the custodians of learning and civilization. Scholars, many of them Jews, flocked from all parts of the world

to Arab seats of learning, where they were cordially received, irrespective of race or religion, as pointed out by George Dorsey. Numerous Arabic texts were translated into European languages, thus rendering possible the great Renaissance. The Canon of Ibn Sina (Avicenna) was used as a textbook in medical schools up to the 17th century. To-day Arab young men and women are flocking to western universities, and through them the West is paying its debt to the East by furthering the Arab renaissance. Six or seven hundred Palestine Arab students annually attend European and American institutions of learning, particularly the American University of Beirut, Syria. The influence of these students is strongly felt in the cultural, social, economic and political life of the country. Professor Hocking, in his book "The Spirit of World Politics" states: "In thinking of Palestinian Arabs we must remember their notables, their scholars, their tradesmen and their artisans with innate deftness and sense of beauty, as well as their farmers, shepherds, nomads." Sir John Hope Simpson says of the fellah (peasant): "He is a competent and capable agriculturalist."

Considering his meager land resources, and the lack of modern agricultural implements at his disposal, the Palestine Arab fellah has fared remarkably well in comparison with American farmers of the middle west, millions of whom are facing destitution and have to depend on government subsidy for their bare livelihood.

Zionist leaders have frequently attempted to justify their invasion of Palestine by pointing out the material improvement in the status of the Arab. It is well to state, however, that a great deal of this improvement is due to Arab initiative which had been held in check by Turkish misrule, and is now asserting itself. The improvement in hospital, sanitation, and educational facilities has been brought about by the British administration aided by the American Friends, the Church Missionary Society of England, and other European philanthropic organizations. Malarial extermination was commenced by the Rockefeller Foundation before the War. The rise in wages of Arab labor, as of American labor, is largely due to a world wide rise in the cost of living. The Arab has benefitted little by Zionist economic improvements and is denied employment in Jewish

undertakings, and membership in Jewish labor unions and marketing cooperatives.

His own culture is largely sufficient for him, and efficient in providing him with an adequate livelihood. The Arab wishes to be left alone and free to avail himself of such external benefits of western civilization as he is ready to absorb and assimilate. In fact, the Arabs have long been in contact with western civilization, culture, and science. They do not need the intervention of others to acquaint them with much that they already know, and they value their independence far above any alleged material benefits, and are not willing to sell their birthright for an economic "mess of pottage."

The Jews: Their Right and Claim to Palestine

THE very name "Palestine" clearly indicates the non-Jewish origin of its original settlers. Today the land is officially called "Filstin"—a name plainly suggestive of the Philistine ethnic element. The Hebrew occupancy of the land did not include Philistia and was never very secure because of tribal differences among the Hebrews themselves and because of the Babylonian conquest which followed. After the return from the Babylonian captivity there were other further difficulties for the Hebrews (or Jews as they were now called) owing to the thrust of neighboring civilizations upon them. Then came the diaspora, a dispersion which continued for many centuries.

And so the history of the Hebrews is but a brief episode of semi-tribal existence among more firmly established civilizations. Never were the Hebrews long in peaceful possession of the land of Palestine because they lacked political coherence and basic tribal unity. The Hebrew kingdom which was established about 1095 B. C. lasted less than a hundred years and was torn by internal strife into the kingdoms of Judah and Israel.

The Jewish claim to Palestine rests on a religious-biblical dogma that is not binding on those who cannot accept it by reason of different belief. In the real world of practical, political and ethnic values, claims are based upon long established legal titles. Whatever sovereign claims the Hebrews had some two thousand years ago to the land of Palestine have long since vanished. Those claims have long since lapsed, according to modern international concepts of national title to land. And this is true not only of the modern Jews but of other racial minorities who have made analogous claims to other parts of the world.

As an example of a spurious championing of such claims one may cite the case of David Lloyd George who once considered the occupation of Upper Silesia by the Germans for a period of three hundred years sufficient ground for the post-war German

claim to that territory. That claim was not unreasonable. Yet it was the same Lloyd George who denied the validity of the Arab claim to Palestine after an occupation of nearly two thousand years. It was the same Lloyd George whose government was responsible for the Balfour Declaration.

The basic inadequacy of the modern Jewish claim to Palestine is well set forth by H. G. Wells, who says in his Outline of History that the great Solomon was a petty chieftain and that his kingdom was but "A pawn between Phoenicia and Egypt." Wells also says, "For three centuries the life of the Hebrews was like the life of a man who insists upon living in the middle of a busy thoroughfare, and is consequently being run over constantly by omnibuses and motor-lorries."

Again Lewis Browne, a Jewish author, states in his book "Stranger Than Fiction" that at its zenith the Jewish Kingdom was but "a doormouse compared to the mighty empires of Egypt and Babylonia."

These Jewish claims have no doubt been thoughtlessly reinforced by many Christians who have been influenced by the Bible—a book necessarily favorable to the Jewish people.

The impertinency of the Jewish claim to modern Palestine was well set forth by the late Morris Jastrow in his Book "Zionism and the Future of Palestine." On page 27 of that book he says: "It is a fact of the utmost significance that the great contribution of the Jews to the world's spiritual treasury was made not while the national life was flourishing, but as it was ebbing away. The prophets with their revolutionary doctrines made their appearance when the southern Kingdom was beginning to show symptoms of decline, and the movement reached its height after this kingdom had disappeared and the national existence of the southern Kingdom was threatened. The religion of the Prophets is the swan song of ancient Hebraism, and the example of a people flourishing without a national background had to be furnished to the world in order to bring the new conception or religion to fruition, which divorced religion from nationality and made it solely the expression of the individual's aspiration for the higher life and for communion with the source of all being. The ancient Hebrews disappeared. It was the Jews, as we

should call the people after the Babylonian exile, who survived, and they survived despite the fact that they never recovered their national independence in the full sense of the word."

Speaking of this perennial Jewish claim to the land of Palestine Hocking (The Spirit of World Politics, p. 375) says: "If one seeks to accent this claim by the statement that the Jews were 'driven out' of their homeland, the assumption is that *conquest gives no rights*; and in that case the British have no right to dispose of the land from which they have driven out the Turks." Hocking also refers to the fact that the Jews were never forcibly exiled except during the years 628-635 A.D. under the emperor Heraclius. Apart from that forcible exile many never left Palestine and those who left did so voluntarily.

Zionism

ZIONISM was originally a religious movement seeking to accelerate or exploit the fulfillment of the biblical promise that some day Jehovah's people would be restored to their land—Palestine. Among orthodox Jews to this day it is believed that this restoration is only to be achieved through divine intervention and not by the secular "mighty arm" of any terrestrial nation. In any case it is unlikely that the Prophets of the Old Testament thought of such restoration in terms of some mundane effort to be made two thousand years or so after their time.

During the latter part of the nineteenth century Europe experienced a minor wave of anti-Semitism. Under those circumstances there arose such Zionists as Leo Pinsker, Moses Hess, Kalischer and Theodore Herzl. With Herzl's publication "The Jewish State" Zionism became more than a religious issue. It became an economic and political issue in terms of contemporary life and events. It became an answer to anti-Semitism. Neither Pinsker nor Herzl, who followed him, thought of Palestine as *the indispensable* land of Zion. To them and to many other Jewish leaders, before and after, the question centered upon the location, without definite geographical position, of a homeland that would give the Jewish people a place and sense of security, dignity and settlement. In such a homeland they would be able to carry out their national life and culture in their own way and without molestation by "Gentiles."

But in Zionism there is a deep-lying motive. That motive is a fear of assimilation by the various nationalities among whom the Jews have lived for centuries as secluded and segregated communities. Such isolation is symbolized by the "Ghetto." And to the "Ghetto" Jews are strongly opposed. Zionism is a child of the Ghetto and, without the Ghetto mentality, cannot live. Zionist leaders who realize this, guard jealously the traditions, institutions, and even superstitions that helped to maintain the particular qualities of the Ghetto life. They consider, for example, the preservation of Yiddish literature as essential to the

Jewish state as the revival of Hebrew. And yet Yiddish literature is as far from Hebrew life and culture, as portrayed in the Old Testament, as the foul air of the Ghetto itself from the brisk, exhilarating air of Palestine.

Since the Great War Zionists have agitated for Palestine on what they term a basis of right and not of sufferance. They have interpreted the Balfour Declaration as granting them that right.

In a masterly article entitled "The Realities of Zionism" published by the Menorah Journal in Nov.-Dec., 1930, Herbert Solow describes the various types of Zionism, and shows that Zionist leaders have adopted a chameleon-like policy by interpreting Zionism to fit the occasion. In his article he says: "Even most extreme Ahad Haamists seemed to have reconciled themselves to the situation, and the Zionist movement has merged the concepts of a 'Cultural center' and the Jewish state in the vague elastic phrase 'Jewish National Home' which each might interpret as he pleased and all might support. This compromise, an unstable mixture, was described by chemist Weizmann as 'Synthetic Zionism' and by him dignified as the new Ideology."

Will Zionism help to solve the Jewish problem?

The late Prof. Jastrow warned his people that far from solving the Jewish problem, the Zionist agitation for a homeland in Palestine will only add intensity to the hatred of the Jews by the nationals among whom they live, who would doubt their loyalty and invite them to go to their new homeland. The following is quoted from Professor Jastrow's book "Zionism and The Future of Palestine":

"The Zionist doctrine as part of the religion lost its 'raison d'etre' when the Jews became citizens of the country in which they had settled. The social instinct which impels a man to have one country also prevents him from having more than one. The essence of Reformed Judaism, viewed from the standpoint of a student of history, lies precisely here, that it freed Judaism and the Jews from the double aspect of being bound both by a religious and a political tie."

Even if the wildest aspirations of the Zionists are realized, Palestine will be too small to hold all the Jews, or even an ap-

preciable number of them, to affect a solution of the Jewish problem. As in the days of the Roman Empire, the Jews were persecuted because of their "amixia," so the Jews of today are persecuted in Europe and disliked in other places because of their unwillingness to play the game with the rest of the populations in the countries where they happen to be. Whether non-assimilation of the Jews is primarily their fault or not, Zionists welcome it as a counter-challenge to anti-Semitism. But it is this very non-assimilation which is at the root of the "Jewish problem" and not the lack of a homeland, as the Zionists wrongly assume. Thus Jastrow says:

"It seems strange indeed to find the Zionists engaged in exerting every nerve to take a step backward, while the whole world seems bent on moving forward. It seems still stranger that Zionists should grow enthusiastic over the prospect of establishing a Jewish State in a land which can only hold one-tenth of the entire number of Jews in the world. It seems strangest of all that they should favor a state which necessarily involves a recognition of some bond between religion and nationality and sets up again the older conception of a nation formed by a single nationality, whereas the history of Palestine itself during the past 2,000 years points unmistakably to its reorganization according to the modern democratic view of the State, based on a national unit formed by peoples irrespective of descent or ethnic qualities. What is needed is a Palestinian State in which all who agree to adhere to the principles on which the country of their birth or adoption is to be organized shall have an equal share."

Far from solving the Jewish problem, Zionism creates two problems where only one had previously existed. Not only does it not counteract anti-Semitism in Europe and America, but it creates a new hatred of the Jews in a Semitic land and among a Semitic people. And this new hatred, unlike the hatred of anti-Semitism, has some justification in the natural and legitimate national aspiration of the Arabs which Zionism seeks to suppress and destroy if possible. The case of Zionism as a solution of the Jewish problem is like the case of a certain village idiot in the interior of Syria who had the habit of hitting the first one

he met before him when somebody hit him from behind. The Arabs had nothing to do with anti-Semitism, but they were the ones to bear the brunt of the reprisal. And the more intense the anti-Semitic rage grows, it seems, the more intent the Zionists are on "taking it out on the Arabs!"

Far from solving the Jewish problem, Zionism evades it.

This interpretation is substantially that of the "Cultural Zionist" represented by Dr. Magnes of the Hebrew University and Asher Ginsberg, who assumed the pen-name of "Ahad-haam" or One of the People. It may be added that the Arabs are not averse to this school of Zionism which seems at present to have been pushed into the background by the more active and aggressive political and nationalist Zionists, especially the Revisionist followers of Vladimir Jabotinsky. The present crisis in Palestine would have been prevented had Zionist leaders heeded the warning of Chancellor Magnes:

"The Joshua method is not the way for us of entering the Promised Land. The retention of bayonets against the will of the majority of the population is repugnant to men of good will, and the Eternal People should rather continue its long wait than attempt to establish a Home in the Holy Land except on terms of understanding and peace."

Vincent Sheean in his book "Personal History" says of Zionism: "The Zionist policy was historically without significance. It might delude two or three generations of Jews who would be better employed in other enterprises; it might humiliate and bewilder the Arabs of Palestine and the surrounding Arab provinces; it might give rise to repeated catastrophes of the kind I had just witnessed (in 1929). But in the end it would be swallowed up in the larger changes through which the world must pass if it was to emerge from chaos and submit to the rule of reason . . . Even though the central idea of Zionism came from something profoundly established in the Jewish heart, the ancient nostalgia for Jerusalem, its political expression was trivial. A noble emotion had here been adapted to small, shabby uses and served no ends but those of imperialism . . . The experience in Palestine had abundantly proved: that the Zionist policy belonged not to the forces of light but to the forces of

darkness. It kept an Arab population in subjection for the achievement of an end unjustifiable in the logic of history, and in its delusion and obfuscation of the Jewish genius it robbed the general world of what might have been—what still must be—a powerful resource. To fight anti-Semitism on its own ground was the duty of every civilized human being, but that duty could never be fulfilled by attempting to expropriate a part of the Arab world. Two wrongs, in the twentieth as in other centuries, were still two wrongs.”

IS ZIONISM A FULFILLMENT OF BIBLICAL PROPHECY?

In answering this question one must keep in mind two varying interpretations of the biblical prophecy—the Jewish and the Christian.

Taking the latter first we find that the coming of the Messiah has already been accomplished in Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of David and the Incarnation of God, the Logos. The fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecies, in so far as they refer to a golden age that has not yet materialized in our troubled world, is linked in Christian theology with the Second Coming of Christ, the Millennial Age and the final Day of Judgment. It has nothing to do anymore with the reestablishment of the Chosen People in Zion—certainly not as non-believers and defiers of the Christ that has come. In the Epistle to the Romans (Chaps. 9-11) St. Paul makes this very clear. The true Sons of Israel and of the Promise are no more the Jews as such, but all those who have believed in Christ and His Gospel of grace. “For they are not all Israel, that are of Israel: neither, because they are Abraham’s seed, are they all children.” (Ro. 9:6 and 7) St. Paul makes clear that the defection and lack of faith of the Israelites is only for a time, when they will finally believe in him and the fullness of grace will have been attained. “For as ye in time past were disobedient to God, but now have obtained mercy by their disobedience, even so have these also been disobedient, that by the mercy shown to you they also may obtain mercy (Ro. 11:30 and 31). Any restoration of the Jews to Zion,

in any political or physical sense was very remote from St. Paul’s mind. But should such an idea have been present in his mind, it is quite obvious that it should be as a reward for faith in Christ, and then all the faithful would be considered on a footing of equality, as spiritual children of Israel.

Pious Christians who support Zionism and give it their moral and mundane blessings should remember that what the Zionists are attempting and what they themselves conceive as the restoration of Israel are two different things.

But even on the basis of the Jewish interpretation present-day Zionism is far from a fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecies. Throughout the prophecies about the restoration (Isaiah, Zachariah, Micha, Joel, the Psalms) it is made, not only clear, but emphatic, that this restoration is to take place through Jehovah’s intervention, in a miraculous manner, and after the subjugation of the Gentiles. In Isaiah we find reference to Cyrus as the “Anointed of Jehovah” at whose hands the restoration was to take place, thus putting the fulfillment of the prophecy way in the past. The Maccabees’ revolt was also considered a fulfillment of such a prophecy. But nowhere in the Old Testament is there any reference to a restoration 2,000 years in the future, through a “Christian” Power whose very name was not known to the prophets of the Old Testament.

Furthermore, the Old Testament prophets knew nothing of Zionists who were atheists, who mocked the very fundamentals of Jewish religion, and who were out and out materialists that believed not in the soul, the Messiah or life after death.

We all know that such Zionists today are the ones who are making the greatest agitation for the possession of Palestine and for making it “as Jewish as England is English.” Vincent Sheehan, in his “Personal History,” speaks of those atheistic Zionists to whom the whole spectacle of Jewish and Arab religious fervor was a mockery, saying:

“Being themselves almost completely irreligious, they could not understand the intimate, unreasoning passion with which a Moslem regards his religion and his shrines.” And from the pages of his fascinating account of his visit to the Holy Land, and his close observations of the riots that followed the Wailing

Wall incident, it is equally obvious that those Zionists had as little understanding of the religious passion of their own Jewish people, the Orthodox Jews, mostly Shephardic, who often recoil from the modern Zionists and who consider the modern Zionist interpretation of the "restoration" as an impious and arrogant one.

The British in Palestine and the Balfour Promise

WITH Arab aid—indispensable under the circumstances—the British conquered Palestine from the Turks in 1917-1918. For that conquest great honor must be accorded the late Colonel Lawrence and King Feisal.

The country then remained under a military administration until July 1, 1920, when a civil administration was set up. Finally the land was mandated to Great Britain for an indefinite period.

But during the Great War two contradictory situations had arisen. First there was the M'Mahon-Hussein Treaty of 1915, according to which Great Britain made extensive promises to the Sherif Hussein. It was explicitly understood that there should be an Arab kingdom embracing what is now Palestine, Syria, Iraq and Arabia. In brief there was to be a Pan-Arab kingdom regardless of religious affiliations.

In a letter addressed on July 14th, 1915, to Sir Henry MacMahon, King Hussein, who had decided to take up arms on the side of the Allies, asked, first, that England should acknowledge the independence of the Arab countries bounded on the north by Mersina and Adana up to the 27th degree of latitude, on the east by the frontiers of Persia up to the Persian Gulf, on the south by the Indian Ocean with the exception of Aden, and on the west by the Red Sea and the Mediterranean up to Mersina, Palestine thus coming within these boundaries.

Replying to the above on October 24th, 1915, Sir Henry MacMahon wrote: I am empowered in the name of the Government of Great Britain to give the following assurances:

"Great Britain is prepared to recognize and support the independence of the Arabs within the territories included in the limits and boundaries proposed by the Sherif. Regarding the Vilayets of Baghdad and Basra, the Arabs will recognize that the established position and interests of Great Britain necessitate special measures of administra-

tion and control in order to secure these territories from foreign aggression."

"The Arab forces have redeemed the pledges given to Great Britain and we should redeem our pledges," said Lloyd George to a Conference in Downing Street on September 19th, 1919, at which King Feisal was present. Again, in his speech in the House of Commons on June 14th, 1921, the Colonial Secretary, reviewing the situation in the Middle East, said: "In order to gain the support of the Arabs against the Turks we, in common with our Allies, made during the war another series of promises to the Arabs of the reconstitution of the Arab nation and, as far as possible, of the restoration of Arab influence and authority in the conquered provinces." These pledges were given in consideration of the help which Arabs rendered to the Allies. Arab forces under the Emir Feisal worked hand in hand with British troops, and hundreds of officers and men under the Arab Prince were Arabs of Palestine.

Furthermore, the Arabs of Palestine were not only friendly to the British Army, but actually helped it in its arduous task.

There was also a secret agreement between Great Britain and France, according to which France was to be re-assured as to her interests and aspirations in Syria. This agreement was the Sykes-Picot Treaty of May 17, 1916.

Then came the well-known Balfour Declaration of November 2, 1917. That declaration was a most unwise one because it conflicted with the M'Mahon-Hussein agreement and because it made to the Jews promises impossible of fulfillment. Thus the British government unfortunately (and perhaps unwittingly) made a promise to the Jews incompatible with a previous agreement with the Arabs. Yet the British went back on their promise to the Arabs in the most shameful manner, as pointed out by an editorial in *The Nation* (New York) of September 11, 1929:

"It was the perversion of all decency, of all standards of common good faith and honesty in that struggle (World War) which led the war-time British Cabinet, loyal to their belief that anything which might help win the war was good and justifiable, into the career of perfidy which lies behind the bloodshed in Palestine today . . . In two years the British appear to have prom-

ised Palestine, which they did not possess, successively to the Arabs, the French and the Jews."

In regard to the Balfour Declaration it is well to quote it here in its exact form. It reads:

THE BALFOUR DECLARATION.

Foreign Office.

November 2nd, 1917.

Dear Lord Rothschild:

I have much pleasure in conveying to you, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations which has been submitted to, and approved by, the Cabinet:

"His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."

I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.

Yours sincerely,

Arthur James Balfour

It is important to note that Balfour promised aid in the establishment of a National Home for the Jewish people and not the conversion of Palestine to a Jewish National Home. The difference is obvious and intentional and not due to a mere slip of the pen. This is clearly indicated in a passage mentioned by Asher Ginsberg in his preface to "At the Crossways," thus:

"All the details of the course of the diplomatic 'conversations' in London leading to the Declaration have not yet been published. But the time has come to reveal one 'secret' which will enable the reader to understand the real meaning of the Declaration.

"'To facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people'—this is the text of the promise which the British Government has made to us. But this was not the text which was proposed to it by the Zionist representatives. They wished to have it read: 'The reconstitution of Palestine as the National Home of the Jewish people.' When the happy hour arrived for the signing and sealing of the Declaration by the Government, it was found to contain the first text instead of the second . . . Understanding persons realized at once the meaning of this. Others thought there was merely a stylistic change. They therefore tried several times thereafter, whenever opportunity presented in their dealings with the Government, to transcribe the promise into the wording as though nothing had been changed. But every time, they found in the Government answer a repetition of the text contained in the Declaration, proving that here was no casual phrase, but that the promise was really limited to this formula."

Vincent Sheean in commenting on the Balfour Declaration in his book "Personal History" makes the following statement:

"Balfour's master hand never did better work than in the rubbery phrases of this sentence. The Arab population of Palestine, outnumbering the Jews then more than ten to one, was referred to only as 'the existing non-Jewish population.' The whole tone of the sentence was that of generosity to both Jew and Arab. The Balfour Declaration seemed to promise the Jews everything and seemed to reserve everything for the Arabs, at one time and with one twist of the pen. I was to learn in Palestine that it had actually given the Jews little, had reserved little for the Arabs, and had one certain purpose only: the installation of the British as the governing power in the country."

Now it is plain that the above declaration is meaningless unless the phrase "a National Home" is properly interpreted. Surely it was not intended that great masses of Jews or other outsiders were to be given the sudden right to make their collective home in a country of only about 10,000 square miles in area, especially when that country was already the home of a long established population. But plainly the British government could never have envisaged a wholesale descent of many

hundred thousand Jews from all points of the compass upon a land which can scarcely support one million people.

The Balfour Declaration was a unilateral promise made in contravention of an earlier agreement with another party. This means that what was first agreed to by British and Arabs for the major benefit of the Arabs was afterwards promised to the Jews for their indefinite benefit. Palestine was and is more than "*a home*" to the Arabs. It is their land, and to that land they have an inalienable right. To the Jews Palestine is "*a home*" only in the sense that some of their people may live there on such land as is not already pre-empted by the native population already established there for many generations. The old settlers (whether Arabs or Jews) plainly have first title to the country, whereas hordes of newcomers of any nationality cannot come without robbing the legitimate occupants of "home" and soil.

But ever since the establishment of the mandate Zionists have plainly been motivated by the following desires: (1) to appropriate as much land as possible; (2) to increase immigration to such a degree that the majority of the population becomes Jewish; (3) to withhold all work on Jewish lands from every non-Jew. These considerations show clearly that no benefit whatsoever can be derived by the Arab from Jewish colonization and immigration. For even if the Arab learns how to improve his own agricultural methods he must ultimately, if the Zionist program is fulfilled, become landless and must sooner or later leave his homeland.

Speaking of these Zionist desires and aims Dr. med. T. Canaan in his pamphlet "The Palestine Arab Cause" (Jerusalem, 1936), page 13, says:

"What did the Government do to counteract these unjust aims? Why was the promise of the 'full protection' of the Arabs not carried out? This promise was given in the first report of the Civil Government of Palestine: 'The policy of H. M. Government contemplated the satisfaction of the legitimate aspirations of the Jewish race throughout the world in relation to Palestine, combined with a full protection of the rights of the existing population . . . The measures to foster the well-being of the Arab should be precisely those which we should adopt

in Palestine if there were no Zionist question and if there had been no Balfour Declaration.'” The above paragraph is quoted in translation from Dr. H. Kohn's work: “Nationalismus und Imperialismus im Vorderen Orient,” page 187.)

The New York *Times* in its issue of October 22, 1930, made the following editorial comment:

“Great Britain's new policy in Palestine is a blow at Zionist aspirations only in the sense that it registers a verdict already pronounced by the facts. The claims of ‘Political Zionism’ were always inadmissible. Neither justice nor the forces of nationalism let loose by the war, nor Great Britain's pledges to the Arab people would tolerate the imposition of Jewish ascendancy by high-pressure methods upon a native population four-fifths hostile. The Jewish Homeland promised in the Balfour Declaration was limited in that document by the rights of the Arab majority. To all but a small faction of zealots it must have been manifest from the first that the building of the Jewish Homeland must take the form of colonization.”

The British Government and responsible Zionist organizations have repeatedly and consistently refused to insist on a precise definition of the Balfour Declaration. The British have failed to do so because of their vested interests in Palestine and the Near East, and the Zionists because of their hopes of a *national state* in the Holy Land. The British Government seems not to have realized that its nominal conquest of Palestine was basically for Arab interests (according to its own pronouncements); while the Zionists seem to have forgotten that the country was only to be “a home” for a small number of orthodox Jews who had gone there for religious reasons and had been willing, either to make a modest living from the land or to be supported on limited funds from their co-religionists. For it must be plain to any reasonably informed person that no large alien population in Palestine can possibly exist without outside subsidy.

The Mandate

IN 1924 the mandates of “Class A” were established for Arab lands formerly under Turkish sovereignty. In this way Palestine came to be mandated by Great Britain. It was generally understood that the mandate should be temporary until such time as the country was able to govern itself. Nothing in the mandate gave outsiders an indefinite right to invade the land to the detriment of the native population. It was generally understood that Great Britain would administer Palestine *in trust* for the Arabs and for such Jews as were there at that time (1924). But the British failed to live up to the expectation. That the Arabs objected to the administration of the Mandate by the British has been very evident from the outset. Criticisms of that administration have come from the Council of the League of Nations and from various other quarters.

In public and international law the term “mandate” is relatively new. The mandatory powers themselves have consistently evaded clarifying the issue and so we must look elsewhere for its true meaning. To those writers who saw the mandate as a legal document it was not hard to speculate and give strictly juridical meanings to its terms and provisions. But since the World Court and other courts have had no occasion to interpret any such terms and provisions, the matter must remain a speculation for writers on history and politics.

That the mandate was intended as a political and not a legal document can be seen from the manner of, and reasons for, its creation. Let us look at the surrounding circumstances.

During the Great War, by secret treaties, three different commitments were made regarding the ultimate disposal of Palestine. In those days and before the Peace Conference all of the small and oppressed nations and nationalities were imbued with great enthusiasm for their freedom and emancipation. The Allied Powers saw to it that the idealism conveyed by the “fourteen points” and “self determination” should penetrate to the remotest corners of the earth. It may be remembered that America's entry into the War which made victory for the Allies possible,

was "to make the world safe for democracy" and not to perpetrate imperialism. Woodrow Wilson's idealism had so permeated the social and diplomatic atmosphere of the world that subject races began to feel that they would soon be ready to set up their own government and determine their own destiny. But hardly had the Peace Conference at Versailles got under way when various secret treaties came to light. Wilson's basic doctrines were circumvented by the astute statesmen of Europe. Great Britain and France were the real masters at Versailles and it was not hard for them to dispose of the former German colonies. But when it came to Syria, Palestine and Iraq, which countries with the rest of the Arab World, had fought side by side with the Allies in order to regain their independence, the task was a little harder. The fate of the Arabs had long been sealed, but the unjust deal meted out to them could not publicly appear as such. The deal handed out to them must appear "sugar coated" and easy to take. There was to be no outright annexation—at least for the present. Imperialism, ostensibly denounced by the Allied statesmen, was now to appear in a new and beautiful cloak. Imperialism now masqueraded under the guise of the "mandate."

With their hopes shattered and their labor lost, the Arabs petitioned Versailles for a final and reasonable request. They asked that Syria and Palestine be allowed to remain, as heretofore, one united country. They asked that only one mandatory power be appointed to assist them in the "art" of self government. For a while it appeared as if this reasonable request would be granted. Wilson sent the Crane-King Commission to the countries in question to conduct a plebiscite. But after a long and exhaustive study the report of the Commission was pigeon-holed and its recommendations completely disregarded. The petition of the Arabs was lost in the general shuffle. The imperialists were still in the saddle and their interests were to come first. So, Syria went to France and Palestine to Britain.

By the Treaty of Sèvres, August 10, 1920, Turkey renounced her sovereignty over Palestine. The Treaty provided that the country should be entrusted to a Mandatory Power which should carry out the terms of the British Declaration, according to a

mandate approved by the League of Nations. Previously the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers held at San Remo, April, 1920, had designated Great Britain as the Mandatory Power over Palestine. It was not until July 24, 1922, when the council of the League of Nations actually approved this arrangement, and not until September, 1923, that the Mandate officially went into effect.

Mr. M. E. Mogannam, a Palestine Arab lawyer, educated in the United States, has rendered the following opinion regarding the legality of the Mandate:

"It has been the considered opinion of the Arabs ever since they were bound to be placed under the British Mandate, against their wishes and without their consent, that the Mandate was repugnant to and inconsistent with the terms of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, which article lays down in paragraph 4, that:

" 'Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as "independent nations" can be provisionally "recognized" subject to the rendering of administrative "advice and assistance" by a Mandatory until such time as they are able to stand alone. The "wishes" of these communities "must be a principal consideration" in the selection of the Mandatory.' "

"To begin with, the wishes of the Arabs in Palestine were not a 'principal consideration in the selection of the Mandate,' nor were they given any choice or say in the matter. In drafting the Mandate the provisional independence of Palestine was completely ignored, entirely irrespective of the express provisions of an international sanction . . .

"It may be interesting to say that Article 22 of the Covenant, the application of which has been insistently demanded, was not originally received with favour by the Arabs. In fact, at the First National Arab Congress, which was held in Damascus on the 2nd of July, 1919, and attended by accredited representatives of all Arab territories, which formed the country commonly known as Syria under the Ottoman regime, including Palestine, the following resolution was taken:

" 'As the Arab people of Syria, including Palestine, are not

lower in civilization than any other of the more advanced nations, or less civilized than the people of Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece, or Rumania as far as their claim to independence is concerned, we protest against Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations whereby our country was included amongst the countries to be administered under Mandate . . .'

"That was the view which was held by the Arabs with regard to this article.

"When, however, Syria and Palestine were placed under two distinct Mandatory Powers, and the Arab people were faced with a 'fait accompli,' they were denied even the application of the principles outlined in Paragraph 4 of that article.

"But considering this point from its legal aspect, it will appear that the Palestine Mandate was actually based on Article 22 of the Covenant, and that from it, it draws its authority. This is clear from the preamble of the Mandate itself, which reads, in part:

"Whereas the Principal Allied Powers agreed, for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, to entrust to a Mandatory selected by the said Powers, the administration of the territory of Palestine which formerly belonged to the Turkish Empire . . .'

"It is likewise clear that the provisions of the Mandate cannot, and should not, be repugnant to, or inconsistent with, the provisions of paragraph 4 of Article 22, following the doctrine that no law or ordinance enacted by any State should be repugnant to the terms or stipulations of the constitution of that State.

"Many provisions of the Mandate are indeed repugnant to, or inconsistent with, Article 22 of the Covenant, under which Palestine's existence as an independent nation was provisionally recognized. To quote some of many examples, Article 1 of the Mandate gives the Mandatory 'full powers of legislation and of administration.' This power is beyond any doubt in direct conflict with the terms of Article 22 which limits the authority of the Mandatory to 'Administrative advice and assistance until such time as they are able to stand alone.'

"Article 2 entitles the Mandatory to 'secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home.' . . . This power is not only inconsistent with the terms of Article 22, but also with the expressed provisions of Article 20 of the Covenant, under which members of the League severally agreed to accept the Covenant as 'abrogating all obligations or undertakings inter-se which are inconsistent with the terms thereof.' Such 'obligations or undertakings' include the Balfour Declaration which was given before this convention, but was, nevertheless, embodied in the preamble of the Mandate.

"Article 3 of the Mandate is also repugnant to Article 22 of the Covenant, in that it is not a question of 'encouraging local autonomy,' but of making provisions for the 'provisional recognition of the independence of Palestine subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance.' The same remarks may equally apply to Article 12, 15, and 16, which give powers to the Mandatory which cannot be construed to fall within the meaning intended by the term 'administrative advice and assistance.'

"It is clear that taken as a whole, this instrument, in letter and in spirit, vests powers in the Mandatory which, by law and by virtue of the authority on which it was based, cannot be conferred; and in so far as it is considered inconsistent with Articles 20 and 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, it must be regarded as 'Ultra Vires.'

Although the provisions of the Mandate were intended to be consistent with Article 22 of the Covenant there are many inconsistencies. Moreover, certain clauses of the Mandate text are ambiguous and mutually contradictory. Let legal experts puzzle over them!

The following may be clearly deduced as the intent and purport of the Mandate:

(a) Palestine is in a position of semi-independence as a state. Its inhabitants are Palestinian nationals and not British.

(b) Palestine is not a British dominion or crown colony. Its territory rightly belongs to its own inhabitants and in no way to Great Britain. Nor should Great Britain absorb the land into her possessions.

(c) It was intended that representative government should

be set up to administer the country and that the Mandatory should be subordinate and concerned only with help and advice to the native population.

(d) The Mandatory is a guardian and trustee for a ward and accountable as such.

(e) The Mandate, by its very terms, is not perpetual and may be terminated at any time.

(f) The chief concern of the Mandate should be (and is) with the inhabitants (as wards) and not with the Mandatory itself.

Thus, the Mandatory, in its administration of Palestine, must be judged by its record of fulfilling, or failing to fulfill, the above considerations.

While Great Britain in Iraq and Transjordan, and France in Syria, have from the beginning of their mandates established a representative government in those countries, yet Great Britain has refused to grant Palestine even a semblance of such government. The two offers to create a legislative council, with half of its members to be appointed by the High Commissioner (to whom there was reserved also the power of veto over any and all acts of the legislative council) were little more than a sham. So Palestine is actually being administered by autocratic rule and dictatorship. Under that rule various penalties are being imposed upon the population in a manner, and to a degree, unworthy of even an uncivilized nation. Whole towns and villages are fined singly and collectively for relatively trivial offences.

In accepting the responsibility of the Mandate, and in assuming the obligations of a guardian and a trustee, Great Britain should be held to a strict accountability. Great Britain should have guarded the property of her ward instead of rendering all public concessions to alien exploiters. Nor should she have imposed preferential duties on British goods nor have unduly protected recent Jewish industries. Such a tariff policy has cost Palestine and its natives thousands of pounds sterling annually.

Moreover, the British Government has failed to live up to its obligations in failing to supply sufficient schools and sufficient employment for natives. That government has placed ill-quali-

fied Englishmen in posts which could have been filled by better qualified Arabs, many of whom were educated in England and other western European countries. Further, such British employees are often paid exorbitant salaries as contrasted with the salaries paid to minor Arab officials. Nor is this all. All such salaries come ultimately out of the revenue and resources of Palestine itself. Palestine pays for British officialdom—not London.

No! Under the British Mandate Palestine has enjoyed neither peace nor security. That Mandate has been exercised, not for justice to the original population, but for British imperial interests, and for Zionist interests, aided and abetted by self-interested Britain. This is a sad record not without hope of correction. Perhaps the Zionists the world over are equally to blame. Have the Zionists, themselves, come into court with clean hands?

No! The fact is that Great Britain is in Palestine, not to protect the interests of the native population, but to protect and perpetuate her own. In fostering Zionism Great Britain has sown the seed of internecine strife among native Palestinians (regardless of origin and current creed); has caused needless friction between natives and recent immigrants; and has caused herself a grave risk of losing her prestige as the foremost power among imperialist nations.

Now, after nearly twenty years of British administration of Palestine, it is high time that Britain should give an accounting of its stewardship. However, reports from Geneva indicate that Britain has refused to accede to the request of the Mandates Commission and submit a report regarding the current revolt. All previous reports to the Mandates Commission were reluctantly given and were far from complete. Will the League assert its power or will it give another demonstration of its impotence? Which will it be? Will the League wreck Imperialism or Imperialism the League and with it the hopes of humanity?

The Present Revolt in Palestine

PRIOR to the current revolt in Palestine (1936) there were four others. The previous disturbances occurred in April 1920, May 1921, August 1929, and October 1933.

The present uprising started on April 19, 1936, when two Arab watchmen in an orange-grove were killed by Jews in retaliation for the killing of two Jews by highway robbers. These trifling incidents were but the spark that started a general conflagration. They were the last straw that broke the camel's back. But there were numerous grievances and predisposing causes which had paved the way and, unless these are thoroughly understood and adequately recognized, little hope can be entertained for ending the present revolt and preventing future disturbances.

Zionist propagandists who have persistently failed to face the facts in Palestine have ascribed previous disturbances to the machinations of effendis, feudal landlords and mischievous agitators. During the present revolt this "explanation" was found inadequate and "foreign propaganda," particularly Italian propaganda, was offered as an additional cause. Italian influence is at this time particularly dangerous to British prestige in the Mediterranean. It is believed that such influence is a convenient scape-goat and one that will alienate the sympathy of British public opinion toward the Arab cause.

The present revolt is definitely the revolt of a majority to defend its inalienable rights against an arrogant and militant minority—the Zionists.

The feverish haste with which Jewish immigrants have been rushed into Palestine clearly indicates the deliberate design of the Zionists to create a Jewish majority and secure complete political control. In fact, at the present speed, they are fast reaching their goal—"the Jewish State." Nor did the repeated peaceful protests, delegations to London, and revolts bring more than Commissions of Investigation, only to have their recommendations completely buried in the archives of Downing Street and ignored by a stubborn Colonial Office which blindly persisted in administering the country for the advantage of the Zionists and

the disadvantage of the Arabs. The best that the British Government ever offered were a few vague promises and these were never fulfilled. Is it any wonder, then, that the Arab, finding himself the victim of an aggressive Zionist policy backed by a vigorous Imperialistic British policy and even by British bayonets, should now be completely out of patience and stirred to open rebellion?

As in most other countries, the majority of the inhabitants of Palestine are plain peasant folk. Their main interest centers around their home and family. They are hard working and honest. The subtle policies of Downing Street and the Zionist Organization spell ruin and futility to them. They see their best land rapidly passing to alien hands, their brothers and friends dispossessed from land and home, their sons and daughters out of work, Englishmen and alien Jews occupying the positions which are legitimately theirs. The grim realities of life and the struggle for existence haunt them like a nightmare; a gloomy future with the prospect of being forced by alien hordes to "trek along" from the land they occupied for centuries. Who can keep cool and moderate under such circumstances? Youth in particular sees this picture and with his vitality, energy, and resurgent hope, but only too aware of what faces him on coming to manhood, should this Zionist encroachment continue. Therefore it is youth that has assumed a dominant role in the present revolt, motivated primarily by the instinct of self preservation.

It was oppression and tyranny that brought on the American and French revolutions, and it is a similar oppression that has led to the disturbances and revolts in Palestine.

Indeed, a century and a half after the Boston Tea Party, the British in the hills and valleys of Palestine hear voices and echoes of Arab Youth reiterating "No taxation without representation" and "Give me liberty or give me death."

Arab Claims and Demands

THE claim of the Arabs to their native land is based first upon prior occupancy of Palestine. The Arabs and their co-Semites who were there before the Great War have a title valid for many past centuries. They feel that Palestine is their land and not the property of hordes of immigrants. Indeed the Arabs themselves have long been impatient with the unsettled international status of their country. They merely ask for independence, self-determination and the right to decide their own destiny. They merely ask for what many small nations received after the Peace Treaty—namely strict autonomy. Such autonomy, they feel, is indispensable to their national interests. For with the Arabs it is as with other formerly subject peoples. Either they must stand on their own feet or revert to the status of a subject people. They propose to stand on their own ground regardless of the Mandate; regardless of imperialism; regardless of Zionism.

Specifically the Arabs claim the following:

- (a) That their land be returned to them, in fee simple, free of mandates and alien intervention and intrigues.
- (b) That they shall no longer be the victims of political and nationalistic Zionism.
- (c) That they are fully competent to administer their own affairs; to set up their own government; to stand as a sovereign state.
- (d) That they do not now, nor will they in the future, oppress non-Arabs in their country, regardless of their nationality, racial origin or religious beliefs. Nor will they, after they regain their autonomy, be hostile to Great Britain or any other Power.
- (e) That they will take their place among the civilized community of nations and be honorable members of a truly new world order.

These just claims and the ever increasing sources of irritation

have led the Arab to formulate the following definite, unequivocal demands:

- (1) That further immigration be stopped.
- (2) That further sale of land to aliens be stopped.
- (3) That a genuine representative government be permitted and forthwith set up.
- (d) That the Mandate be terminated as soon as possible.

Can anyone, properly informed about current conditions in Palestine, doubt that these claims and demands are well within the bounds of reason?

Whither Palestine

WHAT will become of Palestine, the Holy Land, focus of religious and moral culture? What will become of the land sacred to Christians, Jews and Moslems alike? For, the peoples professing the three great religions have such a vested, *spiritual*, interest in the preservation of the land of Palestine as "a home" for its legitimate original occupants and settlers, and as a sanctuary to which the followers of the three great religions may turn in pilgrimage, as John H. Finley once advocated.

Palestine is a spiritual Palladium; a hallowed place; a little region which ought to be regarded as a strictly autonomous area free from alien domination and the profane concerns of mundane imperialism. Neither the secular power of Great Britain, nor the nationalistic thrust of a false Zionism, nor Moslem exclusiveness should dictate the fortunes of this small and peaceful land. Palestine is in effect a modern state, capable of autonomy and ready to take its place among the many other sovereign states whose independence is unquestioned.

All civilized countries have long effected a divorce between Church and State. But for Zionism, that eminently desirable condition would now be realized in Palestine. The next step should be a divorce between Imperialism and State Autonomy. Palestine is weary of its enforced religious and imperialistic partners—partners unsolicited and uninvited.

As for the Jews, perhaps it is not too much to expect that the conscience of World Jewry will disavow the injustice and cruelties incidental to the persistence of political and chauvinistic Zionism.

As for Great Britain, perhaps it is not too much to hope that she has not sold her reputation for justice to the highest bidder. Will she submit much longer to Zionist pressure and remain a victim of her own imperialistic habits?

Is it too much to hope that Great Britain will give up the Mandate? With a free and independent Palestine, British and Arabs will again become friends and allies in the cause of peace. Once more let there be heard: "Peace on Earth, Good Will to Men" in the land where the Prince of Peace, Himself, was born.

Bibliography

- ANDREW, MRS. FANNIE FERN (PHILLIPS). *The Holy Land under mandate*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin company, 1931. 2 v., fronts., plates, ports., fold. map (in pocket), diagr. Bibliography: p. 401-422. DS126.A6.
- ANNALS, THE, of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, November 1932. *Palestine: A Decade of Development*.
- BLAKE, GEORGE STANFIELD. *Geology and water resources of Palestine*. Jerusalem: [Azriel printing works] 1928. 51 p., incl. tables, maps. (Palestine. Geological adviser. [Publication no. 1.]) QE318.B6.
- . *The mineral resources of Palestine and Transjordan*. Jerusalem: Azriel press, 1930. 41 p. (Palestine. Geological adviser. [Publication, no. 2.]) TN113.P3B6.
- CHESTERTON, GILBERT KEITH. *The New Jerusalem*. New York: George H. Doran company [c 1921]. 307 p. DS109.C5, 1921a.
- COKE, R. *The Arab's place in the sun*. London: Thornton Butterworth, Ltd., 1929.
- COOKE, ARTHUR WILLIAM. *Palestine in geography and in history*. London: C. H. Kelly [191-]. 2 v., fold. fronts., maps (part fold.). DS107.3.C7.
- ELSTON, ROY. *The Traveller's handbook for Palestine and Syria*. Revised by Harry Charles Luke . . . with an appendix on the historical interest of the sites and monuments of Palestine by Professor J. Garstang. [2d ed.] London: Simpkin, Marshall, Ltd., 1929. viii, 548 p., fold. front., maps, plans. DS103.E5, 1929.
- FOSDICK, HARRY EMERSON. *A pilgrimage to Palestine*. New York: The Macmillan company, 1927. xiii p., 1 l., 332 p., fold. map. "A selected bibliography for the traveler": p. 295-297. DS107.3.F67.

- GRANT, ELIHU. *The people of Palestine*. An enl. ed. of "*The peasantry of Palestine, life, manners and customs of the village*." Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Company [c 1921]. 271 p., plates. DS112.G7, 1921.
- GRAVES, PHILIP. *Palestine, the land of three faiths*. New York: George H. Doran company [1924?] 2 p. l., 3-286 p., front. (map), plates, ports. DS125.G65, 1924.
- GREAT BRITAIN. Admiralty. *A handbook of Syria (including Palestine)*. Prepared by the Geographical section of the Naval intelligence division, Naval staff, Admiralty. London: H. M. Stationery off.; printed by Frederick Hall at the University press, Oxford [1920]. 723 p., 1 l., xiv pl. on 7 l., tables (1 fold.), 19 cm. DS93.G7.
- . Colonial office. *Palestine*. Correspondence with the Palestine Arab delegation and the Zionist organization. Presented to Parliament by command of His Majesty, June, 1922. London: H. M. Stationery off., 1922. 31 p. (Parliament. Papers by command. Cmd. 1700.) DS125.G7, 1922.
- . ———. *Palestine*. Proposed formation of an Arab agency. Correspondence with the high commissioner for Palestine. London: H. M. Stationery off. [printed by Harrison & sons, Ltd., 1923]. 12 p. ([Parliament. Papers by command.] Cmd. 1989.) DS125.G7, 1923.
- . ———. *Palestine*. Report on immigration, land settlement and development [and Appendix containing maps]. By Sir John Hope Simpson, C.I.E., 1930. Presented to Parliament by command of His Majesty, October, 1930. London: H. M. Stationery off., 1930. 2 v., 5 fold. maps, tables, diagrs. ([Parliament. Papers by command.] Cmd., 3686-3687.) "Glossary": Report, p. 10. HC497.P2A5, 1930.
- . ———. *Palestine*. Statement with regard to British policy. Presented to Parliament by command of His Majesty, May, 1930. London: H. M. Stationery off., 1930. 10 p. (Gt. Brit. Parliament. Sessional papers, 1929-30, v. 16. Cmd. 3582.) J301.K6, 1929-30, v. 16.
- . ———. *Palestine*. Statement of policy by His Majesty's government in the United Kingdom. Presented to Parliament by command of His Majesty, October 1930. London: H. M.

Stationery off., 1930. 23 p. ([Parliament. Papers by command.] Cmd. 3692.) DS126.A5, 1930.

- . ———. *Report by His Britannic Majesty's government to the Council of the League of nations on the administration of Palestine and Transjordan*. London: 1922-1931. 12 v. J693.P22.
- . ———. *The Western or Wailing wall in Jerusalem*. Memorandum by the secretary of state for the colonies. London: H. M. Stationery off., 1928. 6 p. ([Parliament. Papers by command.] Cmd. 3229.) DS109.8.W3G7, 1928.
- . Commission on Palestine disturbances in May, 1921. *Reports of the Commission of inquiry with correspondence relating thereto*. Presented to Parliament by command of His Majesty, October, 1921. London: H. M. Stationery off., 1921. 64 p. (Gt. Brit. Parliament. Sessional papers, 1921, v. 15. Cmd. 1540.) J301.K6, 1921, v. 15.
- . Commission on Palestine disturbances of August, 1929. *Report of the Commission on the Palestine disturbances of August, 1929*. Presented by the secretary of state for the colonies to Parliament by command of His Majesty, March, 1930. London: H. M. Stationery off., 1930. 202 p., 4 fold. maps (incl. front.), 4 diagr. ([Parliament. Papers by command.] Cmd. 3530.) Sir Walter Shaw, chairman. DS126.G7, 1930.
- . ———. . . . *Evidence heard during the 1st [-47] sittings* . . . London: H. M. Stationery off., 1930, 2 v., 34 cm. (Colonial office. Colonial no. 48.) Vol. II includes also a selection from the Exhibits.
- . ———. Vol 3. Index to evidence . . . and selection from the Exhibits. DS126.G7, 1930a.
- . High commissioner for Palestine. *An interim report on the civil administration of Palestine, during the period 1st July, 1920-30th June, 1921* . . . London: Printed and pub. by H. M. Stationery off., 1921. 29 p. incl. tables. ([Parliament. Papers by command.] Cmd. 1499.) Herbert Samuel, high commissioner and commander-in-chief. J691.-T2P3, 1921.

- . ———. *Palestine*. Papers relating to the elections for the Palestine Legislative council, 1923. London: H. M. Stationery off. [printed by Harrison & sons, ltd.], 1923. 12 p. incl. tables. ([Parliament. Papers by command.] Cmd. 1889.) JQ1809.P3A55, 1923.
- . ———. *Palestine*. Report of the high commissioner on the administration of Palestine, 1920-1925. London: Printed and pub. by H. M. Stationery off., 1925. 59 p. (Colonial office [Colonial no. 15].) Herbert Samuel, high commissioner. Official publications relating to Palestine, p. 59. J693.P25, 1925.
- . Dept. of overseas trade. *Report on the economic and financial situation of Palestine*. London: 1927-1931. 5 v., 24½ cm. HC497.P2A3.
- HOCKING, WILLIAM E. *The Spirit of World Politics*. New York: Macmillan, 1932. 562 p.
- JASTROW, MORRIS. *Zionism and the future of Palestine; the fallacies and dangers of political Zionism*. New York: The Macmillan company, 1919. DS149.J35.
- JOINT PALESTINE SURVEY COMMISSION. *Reports of the experts submitted to the joint Palestine survey commission*. Boston, Mass. [Press of Daniels printing co., incorporated], 1928. 741 p., illus., 2 maps, 3 fold. tab., diagrs. Contents—Pt. I: Agricultural colonization. I. The report of Dr. Elwood Mead and associates. II. Summary of economic data relating to Jewish agricultural colonies, by Professor Frank Adams. III. Soil reconnaissance, by A. T. Strahorn. IV. The horticultural possibilities as especially related to agricultural colonization, by K. A. Ryerson. V. Irrigation and water supply, by C. Q. Henriques. VI. Report on education and research, by Professor Jacob Lipman. VII. Report on the Jewish settlements, by Sir John Campbell. VIII. Report on a visit to Palestine, by Sir E. J. Russell. Pt. II; Labor. IX. The labor movement and coöperation, by Dr. Leo Wolman. Pt. III: Public health. X. A sanitary survey, by Professor M. J. Rosenau and Dr. C. F. Willinsky. DS102.J6.

- MACALISTER, ROBERT ALEXANDER STEWART. *A history of civilization in Palestine*. Cambridge [Eng.]: The University press; New York: G. P. Putnam's sons, 1912. vii, 139 p., illus. fold. map. (The Cambridge manuals of science and literature.) Bibliography, p. 130-133. DS118.M13.
- MCCRACKAN, WILLIAM DENISON. *The new Palestine*. An authoritative account of Palestine since the great war; the problems, political, economic and racial, that confront the British administration; with intimate glimpses of the customs of the people, and a keen appreciation for the beauty and mystery of the Holy Land. Boston: The Page company, 1922. xiv, 392 p., plates (part col.), ports., fold. map. DS107.3.M2.
- OLMSTEAD, ALBERT TEN EYCK. *History of Palestine and Syria to the Macedonian conquest*. New York, London: C. Scribner's sons, 1931. xxxii, 664 p., illus., plates, maps (1 fold.), plans, facsim. Bibliographical footnotes. DS121.04.
- PALESTINE—A Decade of Development. American Academy of Political and Social Science. Vol. 164, November, 1932. 275 p.
- PALESTINE ARAB CONGRESS. *Report on the state of Palestine during four years of civil administration submitted to the Mandate commission of the League of nations . . .* [Jerusalem, 1924.] 16 p.
- . ———. *Report, Oct. 13, 1925*. [Jerusalem, 1925.] 30 p.
- . *Four memoranda submitted to the Council and Permanent mandates commission of the League of Nations . . .* 12 Apr. 1925. Jerusalem, 1925, 32 p.
- PALESTINE ARAB DELEGATION TO GREAT BRITAIN, 1921. *The Holy land*. The Moslem-Christian case against Zionist aggression. Official statement, Nov. 1921. London: Harrison & Sons, ltd., 1921. 11 p.
- RIHBANY, ABRAHAM MITRIE. *Wise men from the east and from the west*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin company, 1922, vii, 309 p. Zionism—A new Eastern problem: p. 265-287. CB251.R5.

SAMUEL, MAURICE. *On the rim of the wilderness; the conflict in Palestine*. New York: H. Liveright [c 1931]. 247 p. DS126.S29.

———. *What happened in Palestine; the events of August, 1929, their background and their significance*. Boston, Mass.: The Stratford company [c 1929]. 222 p. DS126.S3.

SHEEAN, VINCENT. *Personal History*. New York: Doubleday Doran, 1936. 398 p.

SOKOLOW, NAHUM. *History of Zionism, 1600-1918*. London, New York [etc.]: Longmans, Green and co., 1919. 2 v., plates, ports., facsim. "Books consulted": v. 2, p. 449-460. DS149.S6.

UNITED STATES. Bureau of foreign and domestic commerce (Dept. of commerce). *Palestine: its commercial resources with particular reference to American trade*, by Addison E. Southard, American consul at Jerusalem. Washington: Govt. print. off., 1922. vi, 64 p., incl. tables, chart. (Special consular reports, no. 83.) HF3861.P2A5, 1922.